



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,473	12/12/2005	Luigi Pichetti	FR920020007US1	3130
50170	7590	07/09/2008		
IBM CORP. (WIP)			EXAMINER	
c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.			BELANI, KISHIN G	
P.O. BOX 832745				
RICHARDSON, TX 75083			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SWALDER@WALDERIPLAW.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/560,473	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PICHETTI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KISHIN G. BELANI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/12/2005</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement submitted on 12-12-2005 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

### ***Preliminary Amendment***

The present Office Action is based upon the original patent application filed on 12/12/2005 as modified by the preliminary amendment filed on 12/12/2005. **Claims 1-7, 9, 11 and 12 are now pending** in the present application.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- On page 5 line 2, replace “network 100 if” by – network 100 is --
- On page 5 line 30, replace “logic/physic” by – logical/physical --

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of

**Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Wang shows and discloses a method of sharing information among at least two data processing entities (abstract which discloses a mechanism in which data from a first application running on a first computer is stored for access over a network by a second application running on a second computer; Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 58-67 through column 3, lines 1-18 disclose the same details), the method including the steps of:

selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (column 1, lines 14-20 that describe the “copy and paste” procedure used among applications, e.g. copying a piece of information from an Excel spreadsheet to a Word document, using the “clipboard” functionality of the operating system, which utilizes RAM memory to temporarily store the information, thereby disclosing selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (Excel spreadsheet)),

storing the block of information in a predefined shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose another approach, applicable in a network environment, that copies content from a source machine and stores to a temporary directory accessible from machines on a network, for example, on a shared file server, and to transfer the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory via the destination machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11

disclose the same details), and  
retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose transferring the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory on a shared file server, into which the selected block of information was copied by the first machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details).

However, Wang does not specifically disclose that storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command; and retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Goodman et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command (Fig. 6 that shows an scripting engine 210 receiving user input 215 to produce a shared file 11 containing information to be installed on a destination computer; paragraphs 0039-0040 which disclose using a "Wizard" (a shortcut) that solicits inputs from a user and translates them into commands; further disclosing in paragraph 0040 that the selected blocks of information are stored in file 11 for sharing or copying to another system later, thereby disclosing storing the block of information in a predefined shared file in response to at least one shortcut (wizard icon) command).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the block of information in a predefined shared file, in response to at least one shortcut command, as taught by Goodman et al in the method of Wang, so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a source computer to a shared file.

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., does not specifically disclose retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Bowers et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command (Fig. 4 that shows a symbolic link 305; paragraph 0026 which discloses that the repository 205c includes a link which provides access to the repository 205b, wherein the file 215, containing the selected block of information from the source computer, is stored; further disclosing that the link can be a UNIX symbolic link, a pointer, or a shortcut).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities, in response to at least one further shortcut command, as taught by Bowers et al in the method of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

Consider **claim 2**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., further shows and discloses the claimed method, wherein the at least one shortcut command includes a customized shortcut command (in Goodman et al. reference, paragraph 0039 which discloses a wizard icon acting as a customized shortcut command),

the step of storing the block of information in the shared file including:

inserting the block of information into a first clipboard of the first data processing entity (in Wang reference, column 1, lines 14-23 which disclose inserting a selected block of information from an Excel spreadsheet (a first data processing entity) to a clipboard of the source computer, using a “Cut” or a “Copy” icons from a toolbar),

opening the shared file in response to the shortcut command (in Wang reference, column 2, lines 5-15 which disclose that the data is stored in the shared file on the network (third computer) in response to an operation performed using the first application, such as a “Copy To” operation, which inherently opens the shared file before copying data into it, thereby disclosing opening the shared file in response to the shortcut command),

pastings the block of information from the first clipboard into the shared file (in Wang reference, column 2, lines 5-15 which disclose that the data is stored in the shared file on the network (third computer) in response to an operation performed using the first application, such as a “Copy To” operation, thereby disclosing pastings the block of information from the first clipboard into the shared file), and



Art Unit: 2154

saving the shared file of sharing information among at least two data processing entities (in Wang reference, column 2, lines 5-15 which disclose that the data is stored in the shared file on the network (third computer) in response to an operation performed using the first application, such as a “Copy To” operation, thereby disclosing saving the shared file).

Consider **claim 9**, Wang discloses a computer program in a computer readable medium, directly loadable into a working memory of a data processing entity, for performing a method of sharing information among at least two data processing entities when the program is run on the data processing entity (claims 18-27; abstract which discloses a mechanism in which data from a first application running on a first computer is stored for access over a network by a second application running on a second computer; Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 58-67 through column 3, lines 1-18 disclose the same details), the method including the steps of:

selecting a block of information (column 1, lines 14-20 that describe the “copy and paste” procedure used among applications, e.g. copying a piece of information from an Excel spreadsheet to a Word document, using the “clipboard” functionality of the operating system, which utilizes RAM memory to temporarily store the information, thereby disclosing selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (Excel spreadsheet)),

storing the block of information in a predefined shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose another approach, applicable in a network environment, that copies content

from a source machine and stores to a temporary directory accessible from machines on a network, for example, on a shared file server, and to transfer the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory via the destination machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details), and retrieving the block of information from the shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose transferring the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory on a shared file server, into which the selected block of information was copied by the first machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details).

However, Wang does not specifically disclose that storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command; and retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Goodman et al. disclose the claimed computer program product, wherein storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command (Fig. 6 that shows an scripting engine 210 receiving user input 215 to produce a shared file 11 containing information to be installed on a destination computer; paragraphs 0039-0040 which disclose using a "Wizard" (a shortcut) that solicits inputs from a user and translates them into commands; further disclosing in paragraph 0040 that the selected blocks of information are stored in file 11 for sharing or copying to another system later, thereby disclosing

storing the block of information in a predefined shared file in response to at least one shortcut (wizard icon) command).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the block of information in a predefined shared file, in response to at least one shortcut command, as taught by Goodman et al in the computer program product of Wang, so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a source computer to a shared file.

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., does not specifically disclose retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Bowers et al. disclose the claimed computer program product, wherein retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command (Fig. 4 that shows a symbolic link 305; paragraph 0026 which discloses that the repository 205c includes a link which provides access to the repository 205b, wherein the file 215, containing the selected block of information from the source computer, is stored; further disclosing that the link can be a UNIX symbolic link, a pointer, or a shortcut).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities, in response to at least one further shortcut command, as taught by Bowers et al in the computer program product of

Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

Consider **claim 11**, Wang shows and discloses a system of sharing information among at least two data processing entities (abstract which discloses a mechanism in which data from a first application running on a first computer is stored for access over a network by a second application running on a second computer; Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 58-67 through column 3, lines 1-18 disclose the same details), the system including:

means for selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (column 1, lines 14-20 that describe the “copy and paste” procedure used among applications, e.g. copying a piece of information from an Excel spreadsheet to a Word document, using the “clipboard” functionality of the operating system, which utilizes RAM memory to temporarily store the information, thereby disclosing selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (Excel spreadsheet));

means for storing the block of information in a predefined shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose another approach, applicable in a network environment, that copies content from a source machine and stores to a temporary directory accessible from machines on a network, for example, on a shared file server, and to transfer the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory via the destination machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details), and

means for retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose transferring the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory on a shared file server, into which the selected block of information was copied by the first machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details).

However, Wang does not specifically disclose that storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command; and retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Goodman et al. show and disclose the claimed system, wherein storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command (Fig. 6 that shows an scripting engine 210 receiving user input 215 to produce a shared file 11 containing information to be installed on a destination computer; paragraphs 0039-0040 which disclose using a "Wizard" (a shortcut) that solicits inputs from a user and translates them into commands; further disclosing in paragraph 0040 that the selected blocks of information are stored in file 11 for sharing or copying to another system later, thereby disclosing storing the block of information in a predefined shared file in response to at least one shortcut (wizard icon) command).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the block of information in a predefined shared

file, in response to at least one shortcut command, as taught by Goodman et al in the system of Wang, so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a source computer to a shared file.

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., does not specifically disclose retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Bowers et al. show and disclose the claimed system, wherein retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command (Fig. 4 that shows a symbolic link 305; paragraph 0026 which discloses that the repository 205c includes a link which provides access to the repository 205b, wherein the file 215, containing the selected block of information from the source computer, is stored; further disclosing that the link can be a UNIX symbolic link, a pointer, or a shortcut).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities, in response to at least one further shortcut command, as taught by Bowers et al in the system of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

Consider **claim 12**, Wang shows and discloses a data processing entity for use in a system for sharing information among at least two data processing entities (abstract which discloses a mechanism in which data from a first application running on a first computer is stored for access over a network by a second application running on a second computer; Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 58-67 through column 3, lines 1-18 disclose the same details), the data processing entity including:

means for selecting a block of information (column 1, lines 14-20 that describe the “copy and paste” procedure used among applications, e.g. copying a piece of information from an Excel spreadsheet to a Word document, using the “clipboard” functionality of the operating system, which utilizes RAM memory to temporarily store the information, thereby disclosing selecting a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities (Excel spreadsheet));

means for storing the block of information in a predefined shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose another approach, applicable in a network environment, that copies content from a source machine and stores to a temporary directory accessible from machines on a network, for example, on a shared file server, and to transfer the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory via the destination machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details), and

means for retrieving the block of information from the shared file (column 1, lines 41-47 which disclose transferring the content to a destination machine by reading the content from the temporary directory on a shared file server, into which the selected block of

information was copied by the first machine; Fig. 4 and column 8, lines 25-67 through column 9, lines 1-11 disclose the same details).

However, Wang does not specifically disclose that storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command; and retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Goodman et al. show and disclose the claimed data processing entity, wherein storing the block of information in a predefined shared file is in response to at least one shortcut command (Fig. 6 that shows an scripting engine 210 receiving user input 215 to produce a shared file 11 containing information to be installed on a destination computer; paragraphs 0039-0040 which disclose using a “Wizard” (a shortcut) that solicits inputs from a user and translates them into commands; further disclosing in paragraph 0040 that the selected blocks of information are stored in file 11 for sharing or copying to another system later, thereby disclosing storing the block of information in a predefined shared file in response to at least one shortcut (wizard icon) command).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the block of information in a predefined shared file, in response to at least one shortcut command, as taught by Goodman et al in the data processing entity of Wang, so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a source computer to a shared file.



However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., does not specifically disclose retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command.

In the same field of endeavor, Bowers et al. show and disclose the claimed data processing entity, wherein retrieving the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities is in response to at least one further shortcut command (Fig. 4 that shows a symbolic link 305; paragraph 0026 which discloses that the repository 205c includes a link which provides access to the repository 205b, wherein the file 215, containing the selected block of information from the source computer, is stored; further disclosing that the link can be a UNIX symbolic link, a pointer, or a shortcut).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve the block of information from the shared file on a second one of the data processing entities, in response to at least one further shortcut command, as taught by Bowers et al in the data processing entity of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

**Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of **Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al.**

**(U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)** and further in view of **Vaha-Sipila et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2001/0054092 A1)**.

Consider **claim 3**, and **as it applies to claim 2 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., further shows and discloses the claimed method, wherein the at least one further shortcut command consists of the shortcut command (in Goodman et al. reference, paragraph 0039 which discloses a wizard icon acting as a customized shortcut command), the step of retrieving the block of information on the second data processing entity including:

opening the shared file in response to the shortcut command (in Wang reference, column 6, lines 44-47 which disclose a query message to the data transfer server 106 (shown in Fig. 1), triggered in response to “Paste” or “Paste From” operation using the second or destination application, which results in opening the shared file in response to the shortcut command (“Paste” or “Paste From”)), and selecting a further block of information in the shared file (column 5, lines 1-7 which further disclose that only a portion of the selected source file may be stored on the shared file on the network, requiring selecting a further block of information in the shared file).

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., does not specifically disclose inserting the further block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and pasting the further block of information from the second clipboard.

In the same field of endeavor, Vaha-Sipila et al. further show and disclose the claimed method, including inserting the further block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and pasting the further block of information from the second clipboard (flowchart of Fig. 4a, steps 102-104 which describe a shared clipboard to which selected and converted data is transferred to and then pasted from the shared clipboard; paragraphs 0029-0030 further describe the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and paste it from the second clipboard, as taught by Vaha-Sipila et al., in the method of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

**Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of **Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)** and further in view of **Dunning et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0229537 A1)** and further in view of **Guinart (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0091999 A1)**.

Consider **claim 4**, and **as it applies to claim 2 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., further shows and discloses the claimed method, including storing information in a shared file on a network.

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., does not explicitly disclose wherein the at least one shortcut command consists of a first and a second shortcut commands, the step of storing the block of information including the automatic execution of the following steps in response to each shortcut command: copying or cutting the block of information into a first clipboard of the first data processing entity in response to the first shortcut command or to the second shortcut command, respectively, flushing the shared file, pasting the block of information from the first clipboard into the shared file, and saving the shared file.

In the same field of endeavor, Dunning et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein commands consist of a first and a second shortcut commands (Fig. 20A, block 1802 that shows a first shortcut with a list of executable commands 2001-2005 that includes “Select all in Playlist” (2002), “Clear Playlist” (2003), “Copy art to Clipboard” (2004), and “Paste art from Clipboard” (2005); Fig. 23F, block 2202H that shows a second shortcut with executable command “Save Playlist”; paragraphs 0280 and 0296 describe the same details), the step of storing the block of information including the execution of the following steps in response to each shortcut command: copying or cutting the block of information into a first clipboard of the first data

processing entity in response to the first shortcut command or to the second shortcut command, respectively (Fig. 20A, “Copy art to Clipboard” command (2004)), flushing the file (Fig. 20A, “Select all in Playlist” command(2002) and “Clear Playlist” command (2003)), pasting the block of information from the first clipboard into the file (Fig. 20A, “Paste art from Clipboard” command (2005)), and saving the file (Fig. 23F, block 2202H that shows a second shortcut with the “Save Playlist” executable command).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose a method wherein the commands consist of a first and a second shortcut commands, the step of storing the block of information including the execution of the following steps in response to each shortcut command: copying or cutting the block of information into a first clipboard of the first data processing entity in response to the first shortcut command or to the second shortcut command, respectively, flushing the file, pasting the block of information from the first clipboard into the file, and saving the file.

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., Bowers et al. and Dunning et al., does not specifically disclose a single shortcut command consisting of a first and a second shortcut commands, and the automatic execution of the listed steps.

In the same field of endeavor, Guinart disclose the claimed method, including a single shortcut command consisting of a first and a second shortcut commands, and the automatic execution of the listed steps (paragraphs 0039-0066 that show a listing of a

Art Unit: 2154

script that includes a plurality of commands (dir, tree, and a greeting command) in a single script file that can be represented as a shortcut; paragraph 0007 which discloses that scripts are frequently used to automate a wide variety of tasks; further disclosing that macros (which are scripts) automate tasks in word processors and spreadsheet applications).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a single shortcut command consisting of a first and a second shortcut commands, so as to automatically execute all the listed steps, as taught by Guinart, in the method of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., Bowers et al, and Dunning et al., so that a user can execute a sequence of steps in a single action over a shortcut.

**Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of **Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)** and further in view of **Dunning et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0229537 A1)** and further in view of **Guinart (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0091999 A1)** and further in view of **Vaha-Sipila et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2001/0054092 A1)**.

Consider **claim 5**, and **as it applies to claim 4 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., Bowers et al., Dunning et al. and Guinart, further shows and discloses the claimed method, wherein the at least one further shortcut command consists of a third shortcut command (in Goodman et al. reference, paragraph 0039 which discloses a wizard icon acting as a customized shortcut command), the step of retrieving the block of information on the second data processing entity including the automatic execution of the following steps in response to the third shortcut command: opening the shared file (in Wang reference, column 6, lines 44-47 which disclose a query message to the data transfer server 106 (shown in Fig. 1), triggered in response to “Paste” or “Paste From” operation using the second or destination application, which results in opening the shared file in response to the third shortcut command (“Paste” or “Paste From”)), and selecting the block of information in the shared file (column 5, lines 1-7 which further disclose that only a portion of the selected source file may be stored on the shared file on the network, requiring selecting the block of information in the shared file).

However, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., Bowers et al., Dunning et al. and Guinart, does not specifically disclose inserting the block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and pasting the block of information from the second clipboard.

In the same field of endeavor, Vaha-Sipila et al. further show and disclose the claimed method, including inserting the block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and pasting the block of information from the second

clipboard (flowchart of Fig. 4a, steps 102-104 which describe a shared clipboard to which selected and converted data is transferred to and then pasted from the shared clipboard; paragraphs 0029-0030 further describe the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert the block of information into a second clipboard of the second data processing entity, and paste it from the second clipboard, as taught by Vaha-Sipila et al., in the method of Wang, as modified by Goodman et al., Bowers et al., Dunning et al. and Guinart, so as to simplify transfer of the selected block of information from a shared file on a network to a destination computer.

**Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of **Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)** and further in view of **Bell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0044723 A1)**.

Consider **claim 6**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., shows and discloses the claimed method, except further including the step of selecting an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities.

In the same field of endeavor, Bell et al. show and disclose the claimed method, further including the step of selecting an extension of the shared file on the first and



second data processing entities (flowchart of Figs. 9A-9B that show a method for sharing media files among a plurality of users; paragraphs 0017, 0033-0034, 0045 describe some of the features of the claimed method; paragraph 0110 further discloses separate drop spots for dragging and dropping user selected media files with different file extensions, such as “.JPG” file-extension associated with DPF (Digital Photo Frame) appliances and image-sharing buddy lists, whereas “.PDF” file-extension types would typically be associated with electronic book appliances and sharing buddy lists, thereby disclosing selecting an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow a user to select an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities, as taught by Bell et al., in the method of Wang, as modified by Bowers et al. and Goodman et al., so as select appropriate type of media file for transmission to an appliance or sharing with buddies.

**Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,325,038 B1)** in view of **Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2003/0225927 A1)** and further in view of **Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0049520 A1)** and further in view of **Delo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,345,386 B1)**.

Consider **claim 7**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Wang, as modified by Goodman et al. and Bowers et al., shows and discloses the claimed method, except wherein a predefined one of the data processing entities stores a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users, the method further including the step of configuring each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user.

In the same field of endeavor, Delo et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein a predefined one of the data processing entities stores a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users (column 2, lines 40-45 which disclose deploying applications (shared files) from a centralized network source, wherein to accomplish advertising, one or more advertising scripts are stored with a policy associated with computer or user policy recipients, and each advertising script includes a product assigned to the policy recipient), the method further including the step of: configuring each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user (Figs. 7-9; column 2, lines 45-50 which further disclose that when one or more advertising scripts are applied, such as to a user at logon or a machine at reboot, assigned applications are advertised as available to the user, i.e. by placing application shortcuts on a start menu or desktop and by writing entries to the system registry).

Art Unit: 2154

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store at a predefined one of the data processing entities, a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users, and configure each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user, as taught by Delo et al., in the method of Wang, as modified by Bowers et al. and Goodman et al., so that multiple users can share common applications.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2143

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2154

Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 270-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

*/Kishin G Belani/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2143*

June 30, 2008

*/Ashok B. Patel/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154*